

**ORIGINAL**

DEREK F. FORAN (CA SBN 224569)  
*DForan@mofo.com*  
 KEVIN LOVE HUBBARD (CA SBN 290759)  
*KHubbard@mofo.com*  
 MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP  
 425 Market Street  
 San Francisco, California 94105-2482  
 Telephone: 415.268.7000  
 Facsimile: 415.268.7522

KERRYANN HAASE MINTON (*Pro Hac Vice Pending*)  
*khminton@michaelbest.com*  
 SARAH E. FLOTTE (*Pro Hac Vice Pending*)  
*seflotte@michaelbest.com*  
 MICHAEL BEST & FRIEDRICH LLP  
 Two Prudential Plaza  
 180 N. Stetson Ave., Suite 2000  
 Chicago, IL 60601  
 Telephone: 312.222.0800  
 Facsimile: 312.222.0818

Attorneys for Subpoenaing Party  
 MASON AWTRY

**FILED**

FEB -5 2016

SUSAN Y. SOONG  
 CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

**JCS**

MASON AWTRY,

Subpoenaing Party,

v.

GLASSDOOR, INC.,

Subpoenaed Party.

**CV 16 80 028 MISC**

(Case No. 14-cv-09206 Pending in  
 Northern District of Illinois)

**NOTICE OF MOTION AND  
 MOTION TO ENFORCE  
 COMPLIANCE WITH THIRD  
 PARTY SUBPOENA**

Date: March 16, 2016  
 Time: 9:30 a.m.  
 Courtroom:

**NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION**

TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that on March 11, 2016, at 9:30 a.m., or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard, in the Courtroom of the Honorable \_\_\_\_\_ of the above-referenced court, located at \_\_\_\_\_, the Subpoenaing Party, Mason Awtry, will and hereby does move the Court for an order compelling Subpoenaed Party Glassdoor, Inc., to comply with the third party subpoena and request for documents issued by Mr. Awtry.

This motion is based on this Notice of Motion, the supporting Memorandum of Points and Authorities, the accompanying Declaration of Mason Awtry and Declaration of Sarah E. Flotte, Esq., and the exhibits attached thereto, and such other written or oral argument as may be presented at or before the time this motion is taken under submission by the Court.

**STATEMENT OF RELIEF REQUEST**

Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 45, Mr. Awtry respectfully requests an order requiring Glassdoor, Inc., to comply with the subpoena served on it in the underlying litigation, Case No. 14-cv-09206, pending in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois.

Dated: February 5, 2016

DEREK F. FORAN  
KEVIN LOVE HUBBARD  
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP

By:  \_\_\_\_\_  
DEREK F. FORAN

Attorneys for Subpoenaing Party  
MASON AWTRY



## MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

### STATEMENT OF ISSUE TO BE DECIDED

Whether this Court should enforce Defendant Mason Awtry's subpoena to non-party Glassdoor, Inc., which seeks limited and specific information about the source of anonymous online posts that are critical to Mr. Awtry's defense in the underlying lawsuit, and where Mr. Awtry can satisfy both prongs of the *Highfields* test developed by the Northern District of California and applicable here.

### RELEVANT BACKGROUND FACTS

This motion arises out of a federal lawsuit pending in the Northern District of Illinois. (See Second Amended Complaint ("Sec. Amd. Comp."), attached as Exhibit A). The Plaintiffs in the underlying lawsuit are Emily Mackie ("Ms. Mackie"), an interior designer in the Chicago area, and the interior design firm she owns, Inspired Interiors, Inc. ("Inspired Interiors"). (Sec. Amd. Comp., ¶¶ 13-14). Defendant Mason Awtry ("Mr. Awtry") is a Chicago-based business owner and entrepreneur, with whom Ms. Mackie had a romantic relationship and a child. (Sec. Amd. Comp., ¶¶ 15, 17; see also Declaration of Mason Awtry ("Awtry Dec."), attached as Exhibit B, ¶ 2).

In the lawsuit, Ms. Mackie alleges that Mr. Awtry defamed her by posting negative comments on her company, Inspired Interiors' website. (Sec. Amd. Comp., ¶¶ 33-37). The alleged defamatory comments include a statement that Ms. Mackie is a liar. (Sec. Amd. Comp. ¶ 35). One of Mr. Awtry's primary defenses to Ms. Mackie's defamation claim is that the alleged statement – that Ms. Mackie is a liar – is true. (Awtry Dec. ¶ 3).

In order to prove that Ms. Mackie is in fact a liar, Mr. Awtry subpoenaed nonparty Glassdoor, Inc. ("Glassdoor") to obtain identifying information regarding the source of negative comments about Mr. Awtry and his business, RightSize Facility, Inc. ("Rightsize"). (See Declaration of Sarah Flotte, Esq. ("Flotte Dec"), attached as Exhibit C, ¶¶ 2-3). Glassdoor is a website that allows employees of a company to post anonymous reviews of what it is like to work there. Glassdoor's website advertises that visitors can "Read Reviews from Employees" and "[s]ee what real employees have to say about any company." See Glassdoor's website, available

1 at <https://www.glassdoor.com/index.htm>.<sup>1</sup>

2 Based on the timing of the four posts on Glassdoor.com, Mr. Awtry believes Ms. Mackie  
3 is their author. (Awtry Dec. ¶ 4). If Mr. Awtry is correct, this evidence will support his defense  
4 that Ms. Mackie is a liar. Indeed, Ms. Mackie was never employed by Rightsize and, therefore,  
5 posing as an employee would be a lie. As detailed below, each negative post about Mr. Awtry  
6 was made on the exact same day as the custody hearings involving Mr. Awtry and Ms. Mackie or  
7 a filing in that case. (Awtry Dec. ¶ 5).

8 The first negative post about Mr. Awtry and his business appeared on March 5, 2015.  
9 That morning, a hearing was held in Ms. Mackie and Mr. Awtry's child custody case. (Awtry  
10 Dec. ¶ 8). In the March 5, 2015 post, authored by a self-identified "Interior Designer in Chicago,  
11 Illinois" who claims to have worked at Rightsize, the author describes Rightsize as "Chaotic."

12 The second Glassdoor.com post appeared on Wednesday, July 8, 2015. Mr. Awtry always  
13 has his son on Wednesday evenings. In addition, a hearing was held in their child custody case  
14 on July 8, 2015. (Awtry Dec. ¶ 11). The July 8, 2015 post, authored by a self-identified "Current  
15 Employee," described Rightsize as the "Worst Ever." (Awtry Dec. ¶ 12).

16 The third post appeared on July 20, 2015, the date on which an emergency motion was  
17 filed in the child custody case. (Awtry Dec. ¶ 13). The July 20, 2015 post, authored by a self-  
18 identified "Former Employee...in Chicago, Illinois," states: "The owner is horrible. He is  
19 unprofessional and rude..." (Awtry Dec. ¶ 14).

20 The fourth Glasdoor.com post appeared on Wednesday, July 22, 2015. Once again, a  
21 hearing was held in Ms. Mackie and Mr. Awtry's child custody case and Mr. Awtry has his son  
22 that day. (Awtry Dec. ¶ 16). The July 22, 2015 post, authored by a self-identified "Interior  
23 Designer in Chicago, Illinois," states that the author worked at Rightsize and that is was the  
24 "Worst Company Ever." (Awtry Dec. ¶ 17).

25  
26 <sup>1</sup> *Reese v. Malone*, 747 F.3d 557 (9th Cir. 2014) ("The court may judicially notice a fact  
27 that is not subject to reasonable dispute because it . . . can be accurately and readily determined  
28 from sources whose accuracy cannot reasonably be questioned.") (*citing* Fed.R.Evid. 201(b)(2));  
*see also Daniels-Hall v. Nat. Educ. Ass'n*, 629 F.3d 992, 998-99 (9th Cir. 2010) (taking judicial  
notice of information, undisputed by the parties, made available on website).



On July 30, 2015, Mr. Awtry subpoenaed Glassdoor to provide information regarding the comments made about Rightsize. (See Glassdoor Subpoena (“Glassdoor Sub.”), attached as Exhibit 1 to Flotte Dec.). In his Subpoena, Mr. Awtry asked Glassdoor to provide for each posted comment: the Internet Protocol (IP) address associated with the comment, the date the comment was posted, the time the comment was posted, and any and all personally identifying information associated with the IP address(es) identified in Response to No. 1. (Glassdoor Sub.).

On August 12, 2015, Glassdoor served on Mr. Awtry its response to the subpoena in which it refused to supply the limited information requested. (See Glassdoor’s Subpoena Response (“Glassdoor Sub. Resp.”), attach as Exhibit 2 to Flotte Dec). In its Response, Glassdoor cited to the First Amendment and the North District of California’s *Highfields* decision as a basis for its objections. (Glassdoor Sub. Resp.)

On September 24, 2015, Mr. Awtry’s counsel spoke with counsel for Glassdoor regarding the subpoena response. (Flotte Dec. ¶ 6). During the call, counsel for Glassdoor explained his client’s position and, again, directed Mr. Awtry’s counsel to the *Highfield’s* decision. (Flotte Dec. ¶ 6). Although productive and in good-faith, the call between counsel could not resolve the dispute. (Flotte Dec. ¶ 6).

Accordingly, Mr. Awtry now seeks to enforce the subpoena to Glassdoor in the Northern District of California, which is the district within which production should be made.

### LEGAL STANDARDS

Under Rule 45(d)(2)(B)(i) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the proper court for a motion to enforce a subpoena is the “district where compliance [with the subpoenas] is required.” *Music Group Maco Commer. Offshore Ltd. v. Does*, 82 F. Supp. 3d 979, 984 (N.D. Cal. 2015).

A district court has “wide latitude in controlling discovery and decisions governing discovery are highly fact-intensive.” *In re Anonymous Online Speakers*, 661 F.3d at 1176 (quoting *White v. City of San Diego*, 605 F.2d 455, 461 (9th Cir. 1979)). In reviewing discovery disputes, a reviewing court applies the highly deferential clear error standard, which is only met when the “reviewing court is left with a ‘definite and firm conviction that a mistake has been committed.’” *In Re Anonymous Online Speakers*, 661 F.3d 1168, 1177 (9th Cir. 2011) (quoting

1 *Cohen v. U.S. Dist. Court*, 586 F.3d 703, 708 (9th Cir. 2009)).

## 2 **ARGUMENT**

3 Although the First Amendment protects the right to anonymous speech, the right to  
 4 anonymity is not absolute. *Music Group*, 82 F. Supp. 3d at 979; *see also Art of Living Found. v.*  
 5 *Does 1-10*, No. 10-5022, 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 129836, \*3 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 9, 2011) (citing  
 6 *McIntyre v. Ohio Elections Comm'n*, 514 U.S. 334, 342 (1995)). “Where anonymous speech is  
 7 alleged to be unlawful, the speaker’s right to remain anonymous may give way to a [party’s] need  
 8 to discover the speaker’s identity ....” *Music Group Macao*, 82 F. Supp. 3d at 983; *see, e.g., In re*  
 9 *Anonymous Online Speakers*, 2011 U.S. App. LEXIS 487 (finding no clear error in requiring  
 10 disclosure of the identity of individuals alleged to have tortiously interfered with plaintiff’s  
 11 contracts by posting anonymous messages on internet blogs); *Columbia Ins. Co. v.*  
 12 *Seescandy.com*, 185 F.R.D. 573 (N.D. Cal. 1999) (allowing discovery as to the identity of an  
 13 anonymous website domain owner alleged to have infringed plaintiff’s trademarks); *see also Sony*  
 14 *Music Entm’t Inc. v. Does 1-40*, 326 F. Supp. 2d 556 (S.D.N.Y. 2004) (cited by Northern District  
 15 of California in *Art of Living*, 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 129836) (allowing discovery of the  
 16 identities of individuals alleged to have illegally downloaded plaintiff’s musical recordings).

17 In *In Re Anonymous Online Speakers*, the Ninth Circuit reviewed the variety of tests  
 18 courts have developed to determine whether an anonymous speaker’s identity should be revealed.  
 19 661 F.3d at 1174-1177. The court noted that the nature of the speech should be the driving force  
 20 when choosing the appropriate standard in weighing the level of protection an anonymous online  
 21 speaker should be afforded. *Id.* at 1977 (discussing differing standards, including that for political  
 22 speech versus commercial speech).

23 In cases involving derogatory statements about a company’s owner and commercial  
 24 criticism, such as here, the Northern District of California recently held that the appropriate  
 25 analysis is set forth in *Highfields Capital Mgmt., L.P. v. Doe*, 385 F. Supp. 2d 969 (N.D. Cal.  
 26 2005). *See Music Group*, 82 F. Supp. 3d at 983. The court in *Highfields* developed a two-part  
 27 test, detailed below, to determine whether the identity of an anonymous speaker should be  
 28 discoverable. While *Highfields* involved a plaintiff’s request for identifying information to



1 pursue its claims against the defendant, as opposed to a defendant's request for identifying  
 2 information to pursue its defense against the plaintiff, its analysis is applicable here. In fact,  
 3 Glassdoor concedes this point. *See* Glassdoor Resp. (arguing for application of *Highfields*).  
 4 Because Mr. Awtry can satisfy both prongs under *Highfields*, the subpoena to Glassdoor should  
 5 be enforced.

6 **A. The Subpoena To Glassdoor Should Be Enforced Because Mr. Awtry Has A**  
 7 **Real Evidentiary Basis For Believing Ms. Mackie Posted The Alleged**  
 8 **Comments, Which Would Support Mr. Awtry's Defense To The Pending**  
 9 **Claims.**

10 Under the first prong of the *Highfields* test, a party seeking to discover an anonymous  
 11 speaker's identity must persuade the court "that there is a real evidentiary basis for believing that  
 12 the [anonymous speaker] has engaged in wrongful conduct that has caused real harm to the  
 13 interests of the [party seeking discovery]." *Highfields*, 385 F. Supp. 2d at 975. "It will help to  
 14 notice that, according to the Ninth Circuit in *Anonymous Online Speakers*, this is a requirement of  
 15 middling rigor." *Music Group Macao Commer. Offshore Ltd.*, 82 F. Supp. 3d at 984. "More  
 16 demanding than the 'good faith' or 'motion to dismiss' standard that some courts have used, the  
 17 *Highfields* 'real evidentiary basis' prong is less demanding than the 'most exacting' test,  
 18 enunciated in *Doe v. Cahill*, 884 A.2d 451 (Del. 2005), which requires a plaintiff to submit  
 19 'sufficient evidence' of each element of its claims 'to survive a hypothetical motion for summary  
 20 judgment.'" *Id.* citing *Anonymous Online Speakers*, 661 F.3d at 1175-77.

21 Here, there can be no dispute that Mr. Awtry has a real evidentiary basis for believing Ms.  
 22 Mackie posted the negative comments about his company on Glassdoor.com. First, Mr. Awtry  
 23 has produced evidence that each of the four posts were made on the same dates as events in the  
 24 contentious custody battle between Mr. Awtry and Ms. Mackie, or on a date in which Mr. Awtry  
 25 had his son. (Awtry Dec. ¶¶ 4-16). In addition, there is evidence that Ms. Mackie is an interior  
 26 designer and two of the posts were made by a self-identified "interior designer." (Awtry Dec. ¶¶  
 27 9, 17). Mr. Awtry also has produced evidence highlighting the similarities between the alleged  
 28 defamatory posts by Mr. Awtry in the underlying litigation and the posts on Glassdoor's website,  
 both of which concern the businesses of the respective parties. *Id.* Compare *Kechara House*



1 *Buddhist Ass'n Malay. v. Doe*, 2015 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 126124, \*11-12 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 18, 2015)  
 2 (finding that party had not shown a “real evidentiary basis” because – unlike here – it “submit[ed]  
 3 no evidence whatsoever...” and did not attach any of the materials in issue or sufficient  
 4 declarations).

5 There also can be no dispute that Ms. Mackie posting the comments on Glassdoor.com  
 6 would support Mr. Awtry’s defense in the pending litigation. Again, in the current, pending case  
 7 that Mr. Awtry is defending against in Illinois, he primarily rests his defense to Ms. Mackie’s  
 8 defamation claim on the fact that she is a liar. In Illinois, “[t]ruth is an absolute defense to  
 9 defamation” claims. *Hnilica v. Rizza Chevrolet, Inc.*, 384 Ill. App. 3d 94, 97 (1st Dist. 2008)  
 10 (“true statements cannot support a claim of defamation”). The fact that Ms. Mackie has posed as  
 11 an anonymous former employee on Glassdoor and posted negative comments based on her  
 12 experience working for Rightsize Facility, when she has not actually worked for the company,  
 13 would support his central defense – that Ms. Mackie is, in fact, a liar.

14 Based upon the evidence submitted by Mr. Awtry, which establishes the suspicious timing  
 15 of the posts, the contentious custody battle, and the similarity between the anonymous speaker  
 16 and Ms. Mackie’s allegations in the Illinois lawsuit, Mr. Awtry clearly meets the moderate  
 17 standard in *Highfields*.

18 **B. The Subpoena To Glassdoor Should Be Enforced Because Disclosure Of The**  
 19 **Anonymous Speaker Would Cause Relatively Little Harm To First**  
 20 **Amendment And Privacy Rights.**

21 The second part of the *Highfields* test provides that if the party seeking discovery is able  
 22 to make a sufficient evidentiary showing to satisfy the first component of the test, then the court  
 23 must balance the harms each party would suffer by a ruling in favor of discovery and a ruling  
 24 against discovery. 385 F. Supp. 2d at 976. “Balancing under *Highfields* requires the court to  
 25 ‘compare the magnitude of the harms that would be to [each of the party’s] competing interests.’”  
 26 *Music Group*, 82 F. Supp. 3d 979 (citing *Highfields*, 385 F. Supp. 2d at 976). The court should  
 27 allow the disclosure if the assessment reveals that enforcing the subpoena would cause relatively  
 28 little harm to the anonymous speaker’s First Amendment and privacy rights while allowing the  
 party seeking discovery to protect against serious wrongs. *Highfields*, 385 F. Supp. 2d at 976.



1 Here, the motion to enforce should be granted because allowing discovery of the  
2 anonymous speaker, if Ms. Mackie, will assist Mr. Awtry in defending against serious allegations  
3 of defamation while causing relatively minimal harm to the anonymous speaker's First  
4 Amendment and privacy rights. To be sure, if it turns out that Ms. Mackie posted the comments  
5 on Glassdoor.com, that means she is a liar because she represented that Rightsize formerly  
6 employed her, which is a lie. Thus, Mr. Awtry will be able to assert the defense of truth in  
7 response to Ms. Mackie's claim that calling her a liar was defamatory. *See Hnilica*, 384 Ill. App.  
8 3d at 97 ("[t]ruth is an absolute defense to defamation" claims).

9 Furthermore, disclosure of the requested information would not chill true employees from  
10 posting on Glassdoor.com because disclosure would be limited to those situations when there is  
11 evidence that the post was fraudulent. *See Art of Living*, 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 129836 at \*26-  
12 28 (noting "the possibility that disclosure will deter other would-be critics or bloggers from  
13 exercising their First Amendment rights" should be considered when weighing the relative harms  
14 of each party); *see also Music Group*, 82 F. Supp. 3d at 986 (noting the court is "concerned that  
15 breaching the defendant's anonymity for this single remark would unduly chill speech, and 'deter  
16 other critics from exercising their First Amendment rights.'"). Here, the possibility that the  
17 anonymous online speaker is not actually an employee, and thus not a true critic, negates the  
18 likelihood that this would prevent actual employees from posting on Glassdoor.com.  
19 Furthermore, disclosure would actually help Glassdoor's reputation as only allowing actual  
20 employees to post on their site.

21 Another factor weighing in favor of disclosure is that users of Glassdoor do not have a  
22 heightened expectation of privacy based upon Glassdoor's Privacy and Cookie Policy. As the  
23 Policy clearly provides: "[w]e will disclose data if we believe in good faith that such disclosure is  
24 necessary to comply with relevant laws or to respond to subpoenas or warrants or legal process  
25 served on us." *See* <https://www.glassdoor.com/about/privacy-cookies.htm>. In the instructive  
26 decision of *Doe v. Individuals*, 561 F. Supp. 2d 249, 255 (D. Conn. 2008), the court allowed  
27 disclosure of the identity an anonymous post under *Highfields* where – as here – the privacy  
28 policy in issue clearly stated that it would reveal personal identifying information to third parties



1 in order to comply with court orders or subpoenas.

2 Enforcement also should be granted because the comments in issue are posted in a manner  
3 that is not sarcastic, but rather is meant to be a serious review on Mr. Awtry's company and his  
4 abilities as a CEO. In *Highfields*, the court noted that none of the comments in issue there posed  
5 any threat to any commercial interest of the plaintiffs because they were so obviously sarcastic  
6 and not in any way attributable as coming from the company so as to ruin its reputation. 385 F.  
7 Supp. 2d at 981. However, the court noted that if the comments had been more realistic than the  
8 balancing of harms might have weighed in favor of the party seeking discovery. *Id.* In contrast,  
9 another court held that disclosure of the anonymous online speaker was appropriate when the  
10 anonymous statements were likely to be taken seriously and to cause harm to the plaintiff's work  
11 and reputation, especially since it was the first entry in an Internet search of the plaintiff's name.  
12 *Fodor v. Doe*, 2011 U.S. Dist. Lexis 49672 at \*13-14 (D. Nev. 2011) (granting third-party  
13 discovery in order to identify an anonymous blogger after applying the *Highfields* test). Here, the  
14 comments on Glassdoor.com more closely resemble those posted in *Fodor*, especially considering  
15 the reviews on the site are the fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh entries in an Internet search of  
16 Rightsize Facility. Glassdoor specifically describes its company reviews as allowing potential  
17 applicants to know "what it's really like to work or interview there according to employees." See  
18 "About Us", [http://www.glassdoor.com/about/index\\_input.htm](http://www.glassdoor.com/about/index_input.htm). Thus, unlike the website in  
19 *Highfields* that was meant to elicit clearly sarcastic opinion or parody, Glassdoor.com is designed  
20 to stimulate accurate reviews that others seriously rely on when choosing a company. Therefore,  
21 the negative posts are likely to cause Mr. Awtry and Rightsize Facility serious harm if they are  
22 denied discovery on the identity of the anonymous online speaker.

23 Finally, it should also be noted that Mr. Awtry is only seeking discovery of limited  
24 Glassdoor.com posts, specifically four out of more than the 8 million company reviews Glassdoor  
25 claims to have compiled. Thus, it is a specific and narrowly tailored request. He has not sought  
26 to cast a wide net in hopes of finding possibly incriminating information, but rather is seeking  
27 limited information regarding the negative comments on Rightsize, which he alleges on  
28 information and belief are actually Ms. Mackie and not a current or former employee. See *Doe v.*



1 *Individuals*, 561 F. Supp. 2d at 255 (denying motion to quash subpoena that identifying  
2 information sought with specificity).

3 Accordingly, because the balance of the *Highfields* test weighs in favor of Mr. Awtry, this  
4 Court should enforce the subpoena to Glassdoor. Should the Court nevertheless have reservation  
5 about disclosure, it could order that the identifying information being sought cannot be shared  
6 with anyone other than the parties in this action and their counsel of record. *See Signature Mgmt.*  
7 *Team, LLC v. Automatic, Inc.*, 941 F. Supp. 2d 1145 (N.D. Cal. 2013) (ordering that identifying  
8 information “may not be disclosed to anyone other than the parties in this action and their counsel  
9 of record without further order of this Court”).

### 10 CONCLUSION

11 As the foregoing demonstrates, Defendant Mason Awtry’s subpoena to non-party  
12 Glassdoor, Inc. should be enforced.

13  
14 Dated: February 5, 2016

DEREK F. FORAN  
KEVIN LOVE HUBBARD  
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP

15  
16  
17 By:  \_\_\_\_\_

DEREK F. FORAN

18  
19 Attorneys for Subpoenaing Party  
MASON AWTRY